UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,277	01/24/2002	Denny Jaeger	4207	6320

7590 03/09/2005

Harris Zimmerman
Suite 710
1330 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94612-2506

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL, JAMES H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/054,277	JAEGER, DENNY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-7, 12-13, 30-34, 36-37, and 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forcier (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,043).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Forcier teaches a PC with a pen-based script/text entry and editing system (*an electronic device that accepts drawn graphic entries and includes a screen display*) that allows a user to construct a script/ASCII document by entering (*inputting an original text portion to be displayed on said screen*) the script text (cursive or printed) and having it translated to ASCII in the background (Col. 11, lines 43-47; Fig. 7). Forcier also teaches gesture-based editing whereby a context-sensitive gesture set is provided for editing text (*using an input device to draw at least one drawn graphic entry associated with said text portion*) and drawings. Forcier continues by teaching that actions resulting from the pen-entered editing gestures, when located in the lined area of the document display will not affect drawings in unlined areas of the display. In other words, the pen-entered editing gestures (Figs. 4a-4h) are used to edit the text areas (Col. 15, lines 25-33). Forcier also teaches, in Fig. 7b) the "insert space" gesture command (*one edit command to change said text portion*) has been performed in the first line of the script, immediately after the printed script.

This was done by placing the cursor between the printed script and the first word of the cursive script, holding the stylus momentarily in one place in contact with the digitizer surface; then moving the stylus tip rightward to an end point spaced inward from the ending point of the line, and lifting the stylus. This action has opened a length of line space defined by the length of the gesture in the first line. The computer document display has also responded to this action by pushing the script to the right of the insert point of the gesture toward the right in the first line, wrapping down into the second line and rightward in each successive line (*displaying an edited text result with the change corresponding to said at least one edit command*). After completion and execution of the insert space gesture, the user drew/wrote a large dot with a rightward-directed arrow, followed by the words "Insert Space Gesture" in printed script, into the space that had been opened by the gesture (*maintaining a display of said original text portion*) (Col. 27, lines 66-67; Col. 28, lines 1-16; Figs. 7b-7c).

In regard to dependent Claims 3-7, Forcier teaches a PC with a pen-based script/text entry and editing system that allows a user to construct a script/ASCII document by entering the script text (cursive or printed) and having it translated to ASCII in the background (Col. 11, lines 43-47; Fig. 7; compare with Claims 3-7, ***"... using an input device to draw a plurality of drawn graphic entries associated with said text portion"***). Forcier also teaches that the device interprets gestures entered on the touch-sensitive screen as a combination of a dot (for editing) (50), or a cursor indicator (for selecting) (52) followed by a gesture. There are a number of recognized gesture pairs for *selecting* and *editing* (see Fig. 4I). Both functions can be performed on

a single letter, or a number of letters, and each generally consist of two separate pen motions, one to select a function (edit or select), and another that invokes the specific function. Together, each of these motions acts to change or modify text. Compare with Claims 3-7), ***"... interpreting at least one of said plurality of drawn graphic entries as an edit command to select at least one letter within said text portion"*** and ***"... interpreting another of said drawn graphic entries as an edit command to change the selected at least one letter within said text portion"***). Forcier also teaches a Delete Line Contents Gesture (60) (Fig. 4d). This gesture deletes the text (ruled) area contents of each line touched by the gesture stroke (Col. 14, lines 65-67; compare specifically with Claim 4, ***"... said device interpreting another of said drawn graphic entries as an edit command to delete the selected at least one letter within said text portion"***). Forcier also teaches that a variety of functions can be applied to selected strokes in text or drawing area. These functions are available through menu selection: delete, cut, copy, paste (all three involved with moving text) ... (Col. 16, lines 25-33; compare specifically with Claim 5, ***"... said device interpreting another of said drawn graphic entries as an edit command to move the selected at least one letter within said text portion"***). Forcier also teaches that a variety of functions can be applied to selected strokes in text or drawing area. These functions are available through menu selection: ... highlight (bold, outline, etc.) (Col. 16, lines 25-33; compare with Claims 6, ***"... said device interpreting another of said drawn graphic entries as an edit command to reformat the selected at least one letter within said text portion"*** and Claim 7, ***"... said device interpreting another of said drawn graphic***

entries as an edit command to place the selected at least one letter in an outline heading format within said text portion"). Forcier also teaches displaying edited text results (see Figs. 7a-7u; compare with Claims 3-7, ***"... displaying an edited text result with the changes corresponding to said edit commands"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Forcier teaches a two-part gesture. The first part initiates gesture control; the second part is the gesture itself. The processor allows the user to perform a pen action within the document to indicate that a control gesture is going to be made that should not be interpreted as an additional text/drawing stroke. The pen action stimulates feedback by causing display of a gesture prompt. So a gesture prompt (first drawn graphic entry) is drawn first, followed by the gesture (edit or select) (second drawn graphic entry) (Col. 13, lines 36-60; compare with Claim 12, ***"... using an input device to draw a first drawn graphic entry, said first drawn graphic entry selecting a chosen portion of said text portion; drawing a second drawn graphic entry comprising an onscreen object adjacent to said text portion, said onscreen object interpreted as an editing command"***). Forcier also teaches in Figs. 4a-d, a filled circle connected to a line with an arrow at the end representing first and second graphic entries). Also see Figs. 7b-c where the complete gesture for selecting and editing is shown along with the results of invoking these actions. Compare with Claim 12, ***"... drawing an arrow between said onscreen object and said chosen portion, whereby said editing command of said onscreen object is applied to said chosen portion"*** and ***"... displaying an edited text result with the change corresponding to said editing command"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 13 (and similarly dependent Claim 37), Forcier teaches a Stretching Box Gesture (64) (Fig. 4g) and a Rope Select Gesture (66) (Fig. 4h). The Stretching Box Select gesture (which might also or alternatively be represented by an icon) selects all drawing area strokes touched/enclosed by the rectangular area. The Rope Select gesture (might also be represented by icon) selects all drawing area strokes touched/enclosed by roped area (Col. 15, lines 60-67; compare with Claim 13 (and similarly Claim 37), ***"... said first drawn graphic entry is drawn substantially to circumscribe at least one of the following within said text portion: a word, a sentence, a paragraph"***).

In regard to independent Claim 30, Claim 30 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 31, Claim 31 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 32, Claim 32 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 33, Claim 33 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 34, Claim 34 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 36, Claim 36 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 12, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 42, Claim 42 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 23, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Manly (U.S. Patent No. 3,676,856).

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Forcier fails to teach *said at least one drawn graphic entry is drawn in a selected color; wherein the interpretation of said at least one drawn graphic entry as at least one edit command corresponds to said selected color.* However, Manly teaches that, for example, a vertical stroke of the editing pen in a particular color along the left hand edge of a character space may be a "start delete"

edit instruction to delete what follows. A horizontal edit stroke of a different color along the top edge of the character space of a succeeding character may be an edit instruction to "stop delete". Hence, the completed instruction is to delete whatever material or blank character spaces were originally disposed between the two edit marks (Col. 3, lines 16-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier and Manly as both of these inventions describe editing gestures performed with a pen device. Adding the teaching of Manly allows for color to be and indicator of an edit action.

In regard to independent Claim 29, Claim 29 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 8-11, 14, 20, 22-23, 35, 38-39, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier.

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Forcier teaches that converting bit-mapped images into a machine editable format requires the image to be decomposed into a series of lines and then mapping the glyphs existing on those lines to line spaces of the appropriate size in a corresponding machine editable document (Col. 37, lines 3-8; compare with Claim 8, ***"... converting each word of said text portion to an individual onscreen object"***). Forcier does not explicitly teach an editing command that does this. However, Forcier's technique allows one to edit text once it has been converted from a bit map (an image containing text) to individual words. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to create a user-defined gesture to perform such a conversion allowing the user to selectively (using a pen device) convert an image of words to a sequence of editable words.

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Forcier teaches that input to the script/text processor can take many forms: writing with a pen (stylus) on a digitizer connected to a computer; existing or stored documents; documents from character (keyboard) based word processors; FAX transmissions and scanned documents (Col. 3, lines 36-47; compare with Claim 9, ***"... said individual onscreen object represents at least one element existing as a readable computer file"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Forcier teaches a selection gesture can cause the selected line space and strokes/words to be highlighted in some way, such as by drawing a transitory line that follows the gesture as shown in Fig. 7D (Col. 14, lines 30-39; compare with Claim 10, ***"... drawing a further onscreen object to modify said at least one element represented by said individual onscreen object"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Forcier teaches a selection gesture can cause the selected line space and strokes/words to be highlighted in some way, such as by drawing a transitory line that follows the gesture as shown in Fig. 7D, or by inverse video (*a different color*) or bolding the selected line space and script or text. With sufficient computing speed, the selected command function can be executed as the gesture is being made. For instance, a line insertion gesture could cause blank lines to be inserted and displayed as the user makes the gesture. This sort of feedback is highly desired by the user (Col. 14, lines 30-39; compare with Claim 11, ***"... said further***

onscreen object is drawn in a selected color, at least one of said elements of said individual onscreen object being displayed in said selected color and being modified by said further onscreen object").

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Forcier teaches a two-part gesture. The first part initiates gesture control; the second part is the gesture itself. The processor allows the user to perform a pen action within the document to indicate that a control gesture is going to be made that should not be interpreted as an additional text/drawing stroke. The pen action stimulates feedback by causing display of a gesture prompt. So a gesture prompt (first drawn graphic entry) is drawn first, followed by the gesture (edit or select) (second drawn graphic entry) (Col. 13, lines 36-60; compare with Claim 14, ***"... using an input device to draw a first drawn graphic entry, said first drawn graphic entry selecting a chosen portion of said text portion"*** and ***"... drawing a second drawn graphic entry comprising an onscreen object adjacent to said text portion"***). Forcier also teaches in Figs. 4a-d, a filled circle connected to a line with an arrow at the end representing first and second graphic entries). Also see Figs. 7b-c where the complete gesture for selecting and editing is shown. Compare with Claim 14, ***"... said onscreen object interpreted as an editing command; drawing an arrow from said chosen portion to said onscreen object"***). Forcier also teaches that a variety of functions can be applied to selected strokes in text or drawing area. These functions are available through menu selection: delete, cut (*whereby said chosen portion is removed from said text portion and placed in said onscreen object*), copy, paste, highlight (bold, outline, etc.) (Col. 16, lines 25-33). Forcier does not explicitly

teach that the *onscreen object is a clipboard*, however the claim describes a "cut" operation that is notoriously well known to be associated with a clipboard. It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that a clipboard could have been associated with a drawn object providing the benefit of performing a "cut" function. Finally, Forcier also teaches displaying edited text results (see Figs. 7a-7u; compare with Claim 14, ***"... displaying an edited text result with said chosen portion deleted"***).

In regard to dependent Claims 20, and 22, Forcier teaches a plurality of editing gestures (Figs. 4, 4a-4i). Many of these are capable of drawing over a text portion (spaces can be interpreted as characters). Forcier also teaches that a variety of functions can be applied to selected strokes in text or drawing area. These functions are available through menu selection: delete, cut, copy, paste, highlight (bold, outline, etc.) (Col. 16, lines 25-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to convert any number of standard proofreading marks into electronic form for use with Forcier benefiting the modern proofreader with an electronic means to perform their tasks.

In regard to independent Claim 35, Claim 35 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 8, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 38, Claim 38 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 39, Claim 39 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent Claim 41, Claim 41 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 15-16, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Taylor (C. Taylor, "Proof Correction Marks", from Popular Communications Courses, see http://www.popcomm.co.uk/proof/marks.html).

In regard to dependent Claim 15 (and similarly dependent Claim 25), Forcier fails to explicitly teach that ***said edited text result includes a symbol representing said onscreen object placed in said text portion at the point where the text is removed***. However, Taylor teaches a number of proof correction marks including several that leave "carat-like" marks indicating edit points (p. 1 of 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier and Taylor as both of these references deal with standard proofreading marks. Taylor adds the benefit of a more complete list of such marks that Forcier could have implemented into electronic form if so inclined.

In regard to dependent Claim 16 (and similarly dependent Claim 26), Forcier teaches that a variety of functions can be applied to selected strokes in text or drawing area. These functions are available through menu selection: delete, cut (*whereby said*

chosen portion is removed from said text portion and placed in said onscreen object), copy, paste, highlight (bold, outline, etc.) (Col. 16, lines 25-33). Compare with Claim 16 (and similarly Claim 26), ***"... touching said symbol to cause said removed text to be re-displayed"***).

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Manly.

In regard to dependent Claims 17-19, neither Forcier fails to explicitly teach that *said onscreen object drawn in a color corresponding to said editing command* or *edited chosen portion in a font color corresponding to said color of said onscreen object* or *touching said edited chosen portion in said font color to cause a display of said onscreen object and the original unedited chosen portion*. However, Manly teaches that, for example, a vertical stroke of the editing pen in a particular color along the left hand edge of a character space may be a "start delete" edit instruction to delete what follows. A horizontal edit stroke of a different color along the top edge of the character space of a succeeding character may be an edit instruction to "stop delete". Hence, the completed instruction is to delete whatever material or blank character spaces were originally disposed between the two edit marks (Col. 3, lines 16-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier and Manly as both of these references describe editing gestures performed with a pen device. Adding the teaching of Manly allows for color to be associated with an edit action.

Claims 21, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Schilit et al. (hereinafter Schilit, U.S. Patent No. 6,279,014).

In regard to dependent Claim 21, Forcier fails to specifically teach *using an input device to draw a plurality of serial numbers over said text portion, each number overlying a respective sentence in said text portion; said serial numbers comprising edit commands to reorder the sentences in the serial order of the numbers; displaying an edited text result with the sentences reordered corresponding to said serial numbers.* However, Schilit teaches annotations made with a pen device to a document (Figs. 3-5). After the attributes are assigned to each annotation at step S140, the control routine proceeds to step S150, where the annotations are *organized, ordered or ranked by the assigned attributes*. Subsequently, the control routine proceeds to step S160, where the annotations are *displayed* for the user. The control routine then proceeds to step S170, where the control routine stops (Col. 5, lines 65-67; Col. 6, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier and Shilit as both inventions deal with pen-entered annotations. Adding Shilit provides the benefit of reordering items indicated by annotations (gestures) based on the internal ranking structure of the annotation.

In regard to independent Claim 40, Claim 40 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 21, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 24, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Kankaanpaa ("FIDS-A Flat-Panel Interactive Display System", 03/1998, IEEE) and in further view of Schilit.

In regard to dependent Claim 24, Forcier fails to explicitly teach *using an input device to draw a continuous line over said text portion, said line extending generally vertically through the lines of text in said text portion; said line including a plurality of indentations, each indentation extending over and selecting individual sentences in said text portion; said device interpreting said line as an edit command to place outline headings in the sentences in the serial order of said indentations; displaying an edited text result with the sentences in said outline headings*. However, Kankaanpaa teaches that some of the possible extensions to their proof correction gestures that could easily be implemented include an indentation gesture (p. 78, Sec. Possible Extensions). Kankaanpaa does not explain an implementation of using this gesture, however it is somewhat understood in the art of proofing a document what one is telling an editor to do when they encounter such a mark. Kankaanpaa suggests that such a mark could be easily implemented in a pen-based text editing system. Kankaanpaa does not suggest an ordering of intent gesture marked text. However, Schilit teaches annotations made with a pen device to a document (Figs. 3-5). After the attributes are assigned to each annotation at step S140, the control routine proceeds to step S150, where the annotations are *organized, ordered or ranked by the assigned attributes*. Subsequently, the control routine proceeds to step S160, where the annotations are *displayed* for the user. The control routine then proceeds to step S170, where the control routine stops

(Col. 5, lines 65-67; Col. 6, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier, Kankaanpaa, and Shilit as all three inventions deal with gestures for editing text. The combination of Kankaanpaa and Shilit provide the benefit of an indention gesture that can also reorder text.

In regard to independent Claim 43, Claim 43 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 24, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Berman et al. (hereinafter Berman, U.S. Patent No. 5,760,773).

In regard to dependent Claim 27, Forcier fails to teach that *said copied text is deleted from said edited text result*. However, Berman teaches a data object 42d, which in this case comprises a "clip box" for carrying out clipboard operations such as copying. An associated action handle 40d consists of a small rectangular box positioned inside the clip box. As contemplated by the invention, if the user wishes to copy certain information to a different page or application, the user can use the clip box as a temporary holding area for the information (Col. 13, lines 29-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier and Berman as both of these references deal with standard proofreading marks. Adding the teaching of Berman provides the benefit of a clip box

object to allow one to perform cut, copy, and paste functions with edited text using a pen-based editing system.

Claims 28, 44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forcier in view of Jacques et al. (hereinafter Jacques, "Paper-less editing and proofreading of electronic documents", EuroTeX 1999 Proceedings).

In regard to dependent Claim 28, Claim 28 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale. In addition, Forcier fails to explicitly teach *entering a known text word which equals at least one of: an action, function, link, association, cause, effect, said known text word to said chosen portion of text according to the logic assigned to said first drawn graphic entry; whereby said chosen text portion is modified by said known text word.* However, Jacques teaches hand-written correction marks of Amaya+PEN system where one of the gestures creates a hyperlink based on additional input (in this case when the gesture is invoked, the system asks for a URL to associate with the hyperlink) (p. 7, Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Forcier, and Jacques as both deal with pen-based text editing gestures. Adding Jacques provides the benefit of adding a hyperlink (a known text word equaling a function, or action, or association with logic).

In regard to independent Claim 44, Claim 44 reflects the method for editing text displayed on the screen as claimed in Claims 1 and 28, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 46, Forcier teaches that converting bit-mapped images into a machine editable format requires the image to be decomposed into a series of lines and then mapping the glyphs existing on those lines to line spaces of the appropriate size in a corresponding machine editable document (Col. 37, lines 3-8; compare with Claim 46, ***"... converting each word of said text portion to an individual onscreen object"***). Forcier does not explicitly teach an editing command that does this. However, Forcier's technique allows one to edit text once it has been converted from a bit map (an image containing text) to individual words. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to create a user-defined gesture to perform such a conversion allowing the user to selectively (using a pen device) convert an image of words to a sequence of editable words.

In regard to dependent Claim 47, Forcier teaches that input to the script/text processor can take many forms: writing with a pen (stylus) on a digitizer connected to a computer; existing or stored documents; documents from character (keyboard) based word processors; FAX transmissions and scanned documents (Col. 3, lines 36-47; compare with Claim 47, ***"... said individual onscreen object represents at least one element existing as a readable computer file"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 48, Forcier teaches a selection gesture can cause the selected line space and strokes/words to be highlighted in some way, such as by drawing a transitory line that follows the gesture as shown in Fig. 7D (Col. 14, lines 30-39; compare with Claim 48, ***"... drawing a further onscreen object to modify said at least one element represented by said individual onscreen object"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 49, Forcier teaches a selection gesture can cause the selected line space and strokes/words to be highlighted in some way, such as by drawing a transitory line that follows the gesture as shown in Fig. 7D, or by inverse video (*a different color*) or bolding the selected line space and script or text. With sufficient computing speed, the selected command function can be executed as the gesture is being made. For instance, a line insertion gesture could cause blank lines to be inserted and displayed as the user makes the gesture. This sort of feedback is highly desired by the user (Col. 14, lines 30-39; compare with Claim 49, ***"... said further onscreen object is drawn in a selected color, at least one of said elements of said individual onscreen object being displayed in said selected color and being modified by said further onscreen object"***).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
03/03/05

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER